WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

	February 13, 2007		or	
TO:	Internal File			
THRU:	Internal File D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor James D. Smith, Environmental Scientist 2006 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, CO-OP Mining Company, Bear Car			
FROM:	James D. Smith, Environmental Scientist)5 10/03/07		
RE:	2006 Third Quarter Water Monitoring, CO-OF Mine, C/015/0025, Task ID #2716	P Mining Company,	Bear Canyon	
7.1-8,	The monitoring plan is described in Section 7. 7.1-9, 7.2-4, and 7.2-5 of the MRP.	2.5, including Table	es 7.1-6, 7.1-7,	
1. Were	data submitted for all of the MRP required s	sites?		
In-mii	ne	YES 🖂	NO 🗌	
SBC-1 t has not been not accessible since early January 2003 because of a roof fall in the Hiawatha workings of Mine #1. SBC-9A replaced SBC-I 1 for monitoring water in this section of the #1 Mine; however, additional roof falls made Mine #1, including SBC-9A, inaccessible. The pipe that carries the water out of the mine to the culinary water supply is now the location for water quality and quantity monitoring, and SBC-9A has been retained as the name for this sampling site.				
Spring	gs	YES 🔀	NO 🗌	
Stream	ns	YES 🖂	NO 🗌	
UPDE	S	YES 🖂	NO 🗌	

"No flow" was reported for all UPDES discharge during the third quarter of 2006.

DMR parameters that are not included in the operational parameter lists in the MRP - such as sanitary wastes, visible foam, and floating solids - are not reported in the electronic submittal to the Division. Operational monitoring values are reported for UPDES flow, TDS, TSS, pH, and total iron. YES 🖂 NO □ Wells Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES 🖂 NO \square In-mine **Springs** YES 🖂 NO \square **Streams** YES 🖂 NO \square **UPDES** YES 🖂 NO \square "No flow" was reported for all UPDES discharge during the third quarter of 2006. YES 🖂 NO □ Wells Were any irregularities found in the data? Listed parameters were outside two standard deviations. In-mine NO \square YES \square YES 🖂 **Springs** NO \square SBC-3 August: water temperature and Cl; SBC-5 August: field conductivity; SBC-9A August: flow and Ca; SBC-12 August: flow and lab conductivity;

2.

3.

SBC-17 August: flow;

SMH-2 <u>August</u>: Ca; SMH-4 <u>July</u>: flow;

SMH-1 <u>July</u>: water temperature; SMH-1 August: lab conductivity;

		SMH-4 August: pH and lab conductivity.				
	Stream	ns	YES 🖂	NO 🗌		
		BC-3 <u>August</u> : cation-anion balance; BC-3 <u>September</u> : DO and flow; MH-1 <u>August</u> : TSS.				
	UPDE	s	YES 🗌	NO 🛚		
		"No flow" was reported for all UPDES discharge during the third quarter of 2006.				
	Wells		YES 🖂	NO 🗌		
		MW-114 <u>July</u> : depth; MW-117 <u>July</u> : depth.				
4.	On wh	On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.				
	(Table Third (August	line parameters are to be taken in August of year 5 prior to each permit renewal e7 .I -8). Baseline parameters were measured August 2000 and included with the l Quarter 2000 data submittal. Baseline parameters were to have been determined in 1st 2005, but they were missed and an NOV was issued. To abate the NOV, baseline yeses are to be done on samples collected in August 2006.				
5.	Based	Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?				
		None.				
6.		he Mine Operator need to submit more informat oring requirements?	ion to fulfill th	is quarter's NO ⊠		
7.	Follow	-up from last quarter, if necessary.				
		None.				

8. Did the Mine Operator submit all the missing and/or irregular data (datum)?

NA

 $O: \label{eq:optimize} O: \label{eq:optimiz$